

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 054118

62

ORIGIN NEA-04

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 /005 R

66603

DRAFTED BY: NEA/TUR:RSDILLON

APPROVED BY: NEA/TUR:RSDILLON

----- 068077

R 031545Z APR 74

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY ANKARA

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 054118

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: MARR, TU,NATO, MCAP

SUBJECT: NATO FORCE PROPOSALS/GOALS 1975-80

REF: ANKARA 2473

FOLL FEPEAT STATE 54118 ACTION NATO INFO USDEL MC USNMR SHAPE
CINCLANT USLOSACLANT USCINCEUR 18 MAR 74 QUOTE

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 054118

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: MCAP, NATO

SUBJECT: NATO FORCE PROPOSALS/GOALS 1975-80

REF: A. USNATO 1233; B. USNATO 1316; C. USNATO 1434

1. IT HAS BEEN, AND REMAINS, OUR HOPE THAT FORCE GOALS
TO BE ADOPTED BY DPC PERMREPS WILL BE REALISTIC SO
THAT COUNTRIES WILL ACCEPT THEM AS THE WORKING PATTERN
FOR BOTH THE STRUCTURE OF THEIR FORCES AND FOR THE
TIMING AND EMPHASIS OF THEIR QUALITATIVE IMPROVEMENTS.
IT IS TO AID IN ARRIVING AT REALISTIC GOALS THAT WE
HAVE SUPPLIED THE US METHODOLOGY WHICH TAKES INTO ACCOUNT
ECONOMIC FACTORS AND SHARPENS PRIORITIES BY COUNTRY
AS IDENTIFIED IN FORCE PROPOSALS. WE DO NOT, HOWEVER,
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 054118

REQUIRE THAT THE EXACT US METHODOLOGY BE ACCEPTED BY

DRC LITERALLY. ALLIES MAY WELL BE ABLE TO SUGGEST ADDITIONAL IMPROVEMENTS. ESSENTIAL POINT IS THAT WE NEED A METHODOLOGY FOR DEVELOPING FORCE GOALS WHICH CONSTITUTE A REASONABLE PATTERN FOR FORCE IMPROVEMENT OBJECTIVES WHICH CAN BE CARRIED OUT. WE WOULD HOPE THAT THIS PROCESS WOULD NARROW THE GAP BETWEEN GOALS AND PLANS IN SOME COUNTRY PROPOSALS. IN ANY EVENT, WE EXPECT TO DISCUSS SHORTFALLS BETWEEN GOALS AND PLANS DURING FALL EXAMINATIONS OF DPQ-74 RESPONSES.

2. AT MARCH 19 DISCUSSION OF US APPROACH, MISSION SHOULD RESPOND TO CRITICISM (PARA 2, REF C) THAT US IS ATTEMPTING TO SUBSTITUTE ITS PRIORITIES FOR THOSE OF NATO'S MILITARY AUTHORITIES BY POINTING OUT THAT WE HOPE NATIONS WILL FULFILL ALL FORCE PROPOSALS OF MILITARY AUTHORITIES, NOT JUST THOSE ITEMS US HAS SELECTED FOR SPECIAL EMPHASIS. WE HAVE EXPLAINED THE CRITERIA WE USED FOR SELECTING THESE ITEMS BUT WE WELCOME RECOMMENDATIONS OF OTHER ALLIES ON HOW TO ADAPT MILITARY COMMITTEE FORCE PROPOSALS TO ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS. AS WE STATED IN OUR ORIGINAL EXPLANATION OF OUR APPROACH (STATE 42348) IN OUR VIEW, THE US SUGGESTED LIST REPRESENTS THE LAST THINGS THAT SHOULD BE DROPPED FROM PRIORITY ONE GOALS. OTHER PROPOSALS NEED NOT BE ELIMINATED BUT CAN BE CARRIED AS PRIORITY TWO OR THREE IF COUNTRIES BELIEVE IT IS POLIICALLY OR ECONOMICALLY IMPORTANT TO RETAIN THEM. AND, AS STATED IN STATE 48057, QUOTE MISSION SHOULD USE OWN JUDGEMENT IN SEEKING OPPORTNITIES TO ENCOURAGE COUNTRIES TO DO MORE. NOTHING IN GUIDANCE BEING FURNISHED TO THE MISSION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS BEING

RESTRICTIVE ON COUNTRY DEFENSE EXPENDITURES IF HEY SHOW THAT THEY ARE WILLING AND ABLE TO DO MORE. END QUOTE.

3. AS TO OUR METHOD OF CALCULATING "REASONABLE CHALLENGE" WE WELCOME PROPOSALS FOR IMPROVED METHODOLOGY. HOWEVER, AS STATED STATE 42348, WE DO NOT BELIEVE IT IS REASONABLE TO CALL FOR INCREASES IN DEFENSE SPENDING BY ONLY ONE PERCENT FOR SOME COUNTRIES WHILE OTHER ARE ASKED TO INCREASE DEFENSE SPENDING BY AS MUCH AS EIGHTY-SIX

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 054118

PERCENT. OUR SELECTION OF PAST PERCENTAGES OF GNP EXPENDED ON DEFENSE AS BASIS FOR PROJECTING FUTURE "REASONABLE CHALLENGE" IS CONSISTENT WITH MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE FOR PREPARING FORCE GOALS. AS MISSION POINTS OUT, BELGIUM PLANS TO DEVOTE A HIGHER LEVEL OF GNP TO DEFENSE THAN IN THE PAST -- THE ONLY COUNTRY WHICH WE HAVE EXAMINED THUS FAR THAT INTENDS TO PURSUE THAT COMMENDABLE COURSE. AS GUIDANCE ON BELGIUM STATED, WE DO

NOT CALL ON BELGIUM TO DECREASE ITS COUNTRY PLANS. ON THE CONTRARY, MISSION INSTRUCTIONS ON BELGIUM (STATE 48627) WERE TO APPLAUD BELGIUM DETERMINATION TO CONTINUE TO INCREASE ITS DEFENSE EXPENDITURES.

4. MISSION INTENTIONS FOR FUTURE DRC FORCE GOAL SESSIONS, AS OUTLINED IN PARA 4, REF B, FIT VERY WELL WITH WASHINGTON VIEWS ON DESIRED OUTCOME OF DRC WORK. HOWEVER, AS TO TIMING OF FORCE GOAL EXERCISE WE PREFER TO KEEP TO ORIGINAL SCHEDULE OF HAVING FORCE GOALS ESTABLISHED BY DPC PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVES EARLY ENOUGH TO BE TAKEN

INTO ACCOUNT IN NATIONAL PLANS FOR FORCES FOR 1975. THEREFORE MISSIONS SHOULD NOT RPT NOT REJECT THE FORCE GOALS WITH THE INTENTION OF REMANDING THEM TO THE MILITARY AUTHORITIES FOR RECONSIDERATION. WE DO NOT BELIEVE IT IS APPROPRIUT TO ASK THE MILITARY AUTHORITIES TO RECONSIDER THE FORCE PROPOSALS. THEY HAVE COMPLETED THEIR TASK: THEY HAVE CONSIDERED FORCE PLANS, THE THREAT, AND MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE. THE PROPOSALS THEY HAVE SUBMITTED REPRESENT THEIR MILITARY JUDGEMENT OF THE FORCES WHICH ARE REQUIRED TO CARRY OUT THEIR ASSIGNED MISSION. THE TASK NOW IS NOT TO CHANGE THEIR ESTIMATE OF THE MILITARY REQUIREMENTS, BUT TO ADJUST THESE REQUIREMENTS IN THE LIGHT OF ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL FACTORS. THIS TASK MUST BE PERFORMED BY THE POLITICAL AUTHORITIES AT THE DRC/DPC LEVEL.

5. WE APPRECIATE DETAILED MISSION REPORTING OF ALLIED REACTIONS TO US PROPOSALS. YOU SHOULD EMPHASIZE THAT OUR PROPOSALS ARE AN ATTEMPT TO IMPROVE THE DRC/DPC DELIBERATIONS WITHIN EXISTING PROCEDURAL FRAMEWORK. HOWEVER, YOU SHOULD MAKE CLEAR THAT OUR APPROACH ON DRAFT

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 054118

FORCE GOALS IS NOT LINKED TO SECRETARY SCHLESINGER'S PROPOSAL FOR CHANGES IN THE DEFENSE PLANNING REVIEW PROCEDURES. WE WILL PROVIDE SPECIFIC PROPOSALS ON THIS SUBJECT BEFORE THE NEXT MINISTERIAL. IN PREPARING GUIDANCE TO PROPOSE THESE REVISIONS, WE WILL TAKE INTO ACCOUNT ALLIED REACTIONS AND MISSION RECOMMENDATIONS GROWING OUT OF EXPERIENCE WITH THE DRC/DPC DEVELOPMENT OF FORCE GOALS.

KISSINGER
UNQUOTE RUSH

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 03 APR 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: garlanwa
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974STATE054118
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: NEA/TUR:RSDILLON
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: RR
Errors: N/A
Film Number: n/a
From: SECSTATE WASHDC
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740468/aaaackny.tel
Line Count: 165
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ORIGIN NEA
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 74 ANKARA 2473
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: garlanwa
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 27 AUG 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <27 AUG 2002 by WorrelSW>; APPROVED <03-Sep-2002 by garlanwa>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: NATO FORCE PROPOSALS/GOALS 1975-80
TAGS: MARR, MCAP, TU, NATO
To: ANKARA
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005